

Kelechi has spent time painting schools, volunteering for nonprofits, and serving as treasurer of the youth branch of the Montclair NAACP. He plans to pursue a career in business or law once he graduates from college.

Mr. Speaker, Kelechi is just one of the many examples of young people in my district making Black history every day. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Kelechi on receiving his Eagle Scout ranking.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DR. JAMES E. CARTER

(Mr. COMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Dr. James E. Carter from my hometown of Tompkinsville, Kentucky, who passed away on February 12, 2018.

For over 50 years, Dr. Jimmy served generations of families in Monroe County as their physician, earning the title of Doctor of the Year by the American Academy of Family Physicians, as well as being named one of America's Top Family Doctors.

Throughout his years of service to his community, he was not only a beloved doctor, but was widely respected for being the leader of one of Kentucky's greatest political families: the Monroe County Carter family.

Dr. Jimmy's father, Abe, also held countless political offices. His uncle, Tim Lee, was a U.S. Congressman. His grandfather, James Carter, and his uncle, James, Jr., held the same circuit judgeship for nearly a century. Dr. Jimmy served on the Monroe County Board of Education and as Monroe County GOP Chair for most of my life.

Although Monroe County has lost one of our greatest public servants, I join with the entire community in celebrating his accomplishments and reflecting on his meaningful, compassionate presence in our life.

May God continue to bless his children, Jim, Tom, Cindy, and Mary Catherine, through whom his legacy lives on.

HONORING THE LIFE OF RAY BAUM

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I come to pay tribute to the life of Ray Baum, the Republican staff director of the House Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ray passed away on Friday after a courageous fight against cancer.

I will always remember Ray as an optimist. During our ongoing committee negotiations on an autonomous vehicles bill, Ray was always pushing us, looking for a solution that both Democrats and Republicans could support. He was always optimistic about our

prospects. Thanks to his prodding, we were able to pass a bipartisan bill out of the committee.

Ray was also extremely committed to being a public servant. When we marked up the Republican's ACA repeal bill, the markup went on in committee all night. Ray was sick at that time, but he refused to leave the markup. Finally, Chairman WALDEN, his staff, and mine convinced Ray to go home. But that did not stop him from watching the lively debate all night long on C-SPAN from home. In fact, my staff was still getting emails throughout the night.

My thoughts and prayers go out to Ray's family, Mr. Speaker, the staff of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and everyone else who knew Ray. He is going to be sorely missed.

WELCOME HOME, ROPER'S COUNTRY STORE AND CAFE

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to work for the Texans in a small town on the Brazos River, in Simonton, Texas.

There is an icon in Simonton that is loved by all in Fort Bend County. It is called Roper's Country Store and Cafe.

Roper's fought Mother Nature twice: the Brazos River dropped by uninvited in 2016, and again with Hurricane Harvey in August of last year.

At 6 a.m., exactly 1 week ago, Roper's beat Mother Nature. As you can see in this photograph, the owner, Lauren Gillespie, is watching Maria Silva welcome Anne, Ramona, and Laura home to Roper's.

I dropped by last Saturday and had a homemade breakfast with Simonton Mayor Louis Boudreaux. Maria was still smiling when I went there Saturday, as I filled up. Her shirt says: Texas Strong.

What that really says is: Simonton Strong, Roper's Strong.

Welcome home, Roper's.

HONORING PASTOR B.R. DANIELS

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Pastor B.R. Daniels as he celebrates 45 years of service at Beth Eden Missionary Baptist Church in Fort Worth, Texas, on February 18.

From an early age, it was his love for the Word of God that led him to pursue a degree in religious studies at the Southern Bible Institute in Dallas. In addition, Pastor Daniels graduated with a master's degree and a Ph.D. in Christian education from Aspen Theological Seminary in Denver, Colorado.

Installed as the pastor of Beth Eden in 1972, his leadership has helped raise the church's profile and membership to nearly 1,000 members. It is due to Pas-

tor Daniels' dynamic leadership that a \$3.2 million building program was completed and celebrated in 2016.

A pillar of the community, Pastor Daniels continues to be an active member of the community by leading the region as moderator of the Northwestern District Baptist Association while also holding various civic leadership positions around the city of Fort Worth and Tarrant County.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to celebrate his 45th pastoral anniversary and his years of spiritual leadership to our community.

LOS ZETAS

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, I went to the Texas-Mexico border near Laredo.

On this, my 20th border trip, I spent time along the river with the Border Patrol. Los Zetas Mexican drug cartel controls a sophisticated smuggling operation of people and drugs. They have scouts on rooftops on both sides of the border, using cell phones and high-tech equipment to look for the Border Patrol.

Everyone pays to be smuggled across the Rio Grande. The cost is \$500 to \$800 for a Mexican; \$3,000 to \$5,000 for a Central American; and \$15,000 to \$30,000 for Chinese or countries of special interest, like Bangladesh. Everybody pays.

This organized crime gang uses stash houses on both sides of the border to conceal border crossers or drugs. When the coast is clear, Los Zetas moves people or drugs further into Texas, and then throughout the country. This is a very sophisticated criminal network.

Mr. Speaker, the outlaw Los Zetas cartel makes millions of dollars on our unsecured border. Enough with the rhetoric. Secure America first.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 1930

BREAKING DOWN THE PRESIDENT'S INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BANKS of Indiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I was trying to add up the number of times that we have been here on floor over the last decade to talk about infrastructure. I suspect it is maybe 20 or 30 times that we have talked about it, and this last weekend, guess what happened on Monday. The President decides to talk about infrastructure. So here we are. On Tuesday, we are going to pick up the issue of infrastructure.

Let me just take a quick tour. Since they don't allow movies or slides here on the floor, we are going to run through these fast.

Some of you remember this. This was 1 year ago yesterday when the Oroville Dam spillway gave way and we had the biggest waterfall in the entire world. It came very close to wiping out 200,000 people—bad maintenance problem.

Or maybe this one. This is not the bridge to nowhere. This is the Interstate 5 bridge between Seattle and Vancouver, British Columbia. It collapsed, and I-5 didn't work.

Or maybe this one. Oh, I think you have heard about this. That would be the water in Flint, Michigan. Still haven't solved the entire problem, but maybe several thousand kids and families were drinking contaminated water, water contaminated with lead.

And I didn't need to go all the way back to Flint, Michigan, to find a problem. In my own State of California, many communities are facing the same problem: either contaminated water or no water.

We have got an infrastructure problem: dams breaking, bridges falling, water contaminated. Are you wondering why? Well, this is illustrative.

You see, way, way back in 1973, we were spending somewhere about \$10 billion a year on clean water and sanitation, drinking water. And over the years, we have seen a decline. This is constant dollars, 2014 dollars. We have seen a decline in the purchasing power so that, in 2016, we were somewhere around \$2 billion, so from 10 to 2.

Do you wonder why we have a problem? We are not spending the money on it.

And so the American Society of Civil Engineers comes out with an annual report card. Now, if your kids sent home this report card, you might have a serious conversation with them.

So Donald Trump comes into office and, whoa, we have got an infrastructure problem. And he comes up with a solution to address this report card from the American Society of Civil Engineers: oh, aviation, D; bridges, C-plus; dams, D; drinking water, D.

Let's go over here; rail is a B. That is good. But most of those are private companies.

Ports, a C-plus; parks and recreation, D; schools, a D-plus; solid waste, transit, D, D, D, all the way down. Yep, we have got a problem. We have got a serious problem.

And so what does it mean if we were to solve the problem? Well, here, let's solve that problem. We will turn this around. Well, the problem is all of those D's that you saw.

So what if we were to spend \$1—how about \$1 billion—on transportation infrastructure, the return to the economy is somewhere around \$3.54; or, for every \$1 billion that we invest in transportation and infrastructure, 21,671 jobs. A 6-year bill with at least \$100 billion of annual funding supports 2.18 million American jobs.

Now, what is it that our esteemed President proposed? Well, here is his infrastructure plan: He cuts more than \$168 billion over the next 10 years from

existing transportation and infrastructure programs. He provides Wall Street with an opportunity to invest and slashes the Federal investments and passes the buck to the cities and the counties in the State. That is his infrastructure plan.

Oh, did I tell you he said he had \$200 billion that he was going to use to leverage \$1.3 trillion of private money? Well, it doesn't really work. And we are going to talk about that because what actually happens, that \$200 billion that is so beautiful, so awesome, incredible—what is it?

Well, let's see. I have already said that, from the highway safety programs, total, \$122 billion; from the TIGER grants, which are very popular, that go out to local entities to build specific transportation programs like intermodal—train, bus, rail, highway stations—cuts that by \$5 billion; Amtrak, cuts that by \$7.5 billion over the next 10 years; rural air service, cuts by \$590 million; the Army Corps of Engineers, cuts that by \$10.1 billion over the next years.

These are real programs. So what is that \$200 billion that the President takes such pride in presenting to the American public? It is money that is already spent on infrastructure projects. There is zero—no, nada, no new money. He is simply taking money from those programs that I just described and transferring it to a new set of programs that, well, he will probably put T-R-U-M-P in gold across the top of it and say: Look what we have done.

All you have done is to create administrative chaos. Not one nickel of new money. It is the repurposing of existing dollars and transferring it to new programs which, instead of 80 percent Federal money to 20 percent local money, he flips it on its head, and now the Federal Government will spend 20 percent and the local governments and State governments will spend 80 percent.

Huh? How does that work? Where is the Federal investment? No new money. And instead of the Federal Government being the big partner, the Federal Government becomes the minor partner. What is that all about?

Well, unless you happen to be a Wall Street baron and you want to buy Dulles Airport, in which case his program would pony up 80 percent of the money and the private investor would put up 20 percent of the money; and I guarantee air travelers, international and domestic, would be thoroughly paying higher fees for the privilege of going to Dulles, which is now a private airport. It doesn't make much sense.

Or maybe you want to travel on Interstate 5 from Mexico to Canada. He would propose that we turn Interstate 5, all the way up the West Coast, into a privately held toll road, of which, presumably, 80 percent would be paid for by some loan or some grant from the Federal Government and 20 percent by some Wall Street investors.

Final point, and then I want to turn to my colleagues, as I said, we have

been here on the floor perhaps 20 or 30 times over the last several years talking about infrastructure. I will tell you this: The Democrats are proposing a better deal for America. We want to invest in America, and we want it made in America.

Oh, by the way, in the President's proposal is the elimination of the Buy America standards and the Davis-Bacon fair wage program.

So we have a better way of doing it, and we are going to spend a little bit of tonight talking about how we might have a better real deal for America, not some fake program that doesn't have any new money.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the Congressman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) to talk about infrastructure.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, JOHN GARAMENDI, for taking up the special orders and for doing such a striking job, compelling job, of lining out what the country needs to do in the way of building our roads and bridges and our energy infrastructure. So much that needs to be done that would make a big difference for jobs, for our economy; and then contrasting that, unfortunately, with what the President, after a year of looking forward to this, seems to have come up with. It is just baffling, and I think we need to understand here tonight what is going on and resolve to do better. We have got to do better than this.

Although the President is, of course, onto a major issue, we have always said that. During the campaign, in the early months of the new administration, President Trump spoke a lot about infrastructure, promised to put forward a bold plan to put Americans to work, repairing, modernizing our infrastructure.

Now, many issues divide Democrats and Republicans, but that really isn't one of them. This is an issue that potentially, at least, unifies us, brings us together. During the last election, both candidates were talking infrastructure. It stood out as an area of common ground, potential bipartisan cooperation.

Unfortunately, I am afraid, now, after a year, and after a year of concentrating on other things like repealing healthcare and a massive tax cut for the wealthy, now, finally, the President does come around to infrastructure, and, frankly, it is pretty underwhelming. The plan doesn't make good on the promise that he put forward during the campaign for a serious bipartisan plan. It certainly isn't bipartisan.

It calls for \$1.5 trillion in new investment, but it shifts the overwhelming majority of the cost to States and municipalities, forcing them to either raise taxes or to sell off public assets or to cut other critical programs. So it is, on the face of it, just inadequate.

The Federal investment: \$200 billion supposed to leverage \$1.5 trillion. And it reverses the split in terms of Federal

and State responsibility. That is an 80/20 Federal-State split now, in most cases. Now it is going to go something like 20/80, and the States and the localities are burdened with taking this on with very limited and very inadequate Federal support. So it is inadequate, and it is certainly inadequate as a Federal investment.

Secondly, and my colleague has stressed this very effectively, this is a bait and switch. This is a bait and switch.

I am the ranking Democrat on the Transportation and Housing Appropriations Subcommittee. So we are now, with the budget agreement enacted last week, looking forward, hopefully in a bipartisan way, to writing a transportation bill for the remainder of 2018. Transportation investments that have bipartisan support are now in sight because of this budget agreement. But then along comes, ironically, the President's infrastructure plan alongside his budget proposal, which actually decimates the transportation programs we already have.

□ 1945

Mr. GARAMENDI stressed that very effectively. I will add just a few specifics, but this is the most incredible part of this plan to me. It not only falls short, but it actually does great damage to the infrastructure investments we are already making.

For example, we are building Union Station in Raleigh, North Carolina, at this moment. It is going to be a multimodal facility. It is going to facilitate transit bus transportation. It is also an intercity rail station with an Amtrak train leaving for Charlotte three times a day. That is going to be increased because it is a very successful run. Union Station, a multimodal facility: the essence of infrastructure, creating jobs.

How do you think Raleigh is paying for that?

It would be known as a TIGER grant, along with State and local participation. The President's budget totally eliminates TIGER grants, which have provided that kind of support around this country for innovative infrastructure projects, particularly multimodal projects.

TIGER grants: eliminated in the President's budget.

Community Development Block Grants: eliminated in the President's budget.

What on Earth are they thinking down there at the White House, to be simultaneously talking about a great infrastructure initiative and, at the same time, taking away the basic bread and butter infrastructure programs we already have?

Aviation: the President wants to cut Federal aviation appropriations.

FAA facilities and equipment: cut.

FAA operations: cut.

What are they thinking?

And then most incredible of all, when you turn to the ground transportation

budget, they want to eliminate all new starts for mass transit in this country: cut the so-called capital investment grants radically.

The President wants to cut the very successful Northeast Corridor Amtrak operations radically. He wants even more to cut Amtrak operations in places like the Southeastern United States, the Midwest, and California—these very promising regional routes.

And this is an infrastructure program?

It certainly sounds like an anti-infrastructure program.

It does not add up. It doesn't begin to add up.

I think this is the most outrageous aspect of this: that the President is coming out with what he markets as a new, bold initiative, and, at the same time, he is actually not just trimming, he is radically cutting, as far as I can tell, all modes of transportation, virtually everything we count on to underwrite and support infrastructure at present.

Then, finally, the President is making a big thing out of rolling back environmental protections and limiting the review of projects. Now, we all know—and Democrats and Republicans have gotten together on this in the FAST Act, for example—that review needs to be expedited and review needs to be efficient.

The FAST Act contains many provisions to expedite review, and those aren't even fully implemented yet. But here we come with the President's infrastructure initiative, which proposes the arbitrary shortening of deadlines. It purports to override the National Environmental Policy Act, possibly even the Clean Water Act and Clean Air Act. It is hard to tell exactly what he has in mind. There is virtually no investment in clean energy infrastructure, which one would think would be a major forward-looking component of any infrastructure package.

Representative ALAN LOWENTHAL and I co-chair a task force called the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition—so-called SEEC—and we have released in the last couple of days a sustainable infrastructure proposal. When you place it alongside what the President seems to be suggesting, with some details yet to be announced, there is a great contrast.

What we are advocating is that we invest smartly and we invest sustainably. We have no desire to destroy the core environmental safeguards. In fact, we want to have a meaningful, serious review process. We want to incorporate forward-looking sustainability and resiliency initiatives in our infrastructure plan.

So I commend to my colleagues this report, which we just issued, which I hope will gain attention from both sides of the aisle as we attempt to deal with the President's proposal, to deal with the appropriations bills that we are going to be considering here, and try to build into our infrastructure

proposals sound environmental practices, and sustainable practices, for example, taking into account climate change—global warming.

The President reportedly has no intention of including that in his proposal. What a shortsighted thing that would be, to be building bridges and highways and other projects, and then some years from now find that the planning was inadequate to deal with the sea level rise, or whatever kind of effects of global warming we might have.

So, again, I thank my colleague for helping us understand what we need to do as a country, but also understanding how we really need, as a Congress—and I would hope both sides of the aisle. We need to assert ourselves, not just assume that this is some kind of Trump proposal that we can't criticize. Or, in fact, we need to not just criticize it, but we need to do far, far better. So I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PRICE for the specific details. I am glad that he brought up the environment issues. They certainly need to be discussed.

And he is quite correct, the FAST Act, which is now just 2 years old, significantly moved projects faster through the entire program—I suppose we ought to say the FAST Act had some logic to it—and still maintained the underlying strong desire to protect our environment.

Climate change: he couldn't be more correct about that, and the specific programs that he mentioned that the President intends to cut.

If this was some sort of a—I don't know—State fair, and you had somebody on the boardwalk with the shell game, that is what is being played here. Programs that are working—he mentioned the TIGER program and the funding programs that the States and local municipalities know how to use and are now planning to put their own money in—the President would terminate those and start a whole new series of programs. New administrative, new chaos.

We have to make this point: all of us want infrastructure.

Here is the report card: Ds, Ds, Ds, one B, and a couple of Cs along the way.

Just to maintain these programs at the present would be \$2 trillion—not building new, not adding to what we have, but \$2 trillion—just to maintain this.

What does the President offer us?

\$200 billion. That is a B, not a T. \$200 billion. The same money that we are already spending. No new dollars. Somehow that would leverage State, local, and private.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PRICE for bringing this to our attention.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman shares

my sense that we need to diversify our transportation system in this country. We, in particular, need to develop high-speed rail in these corridors where it makes so much sense. Raleigh to Charlotte has been a kind of demonstration of what is possible there.

And transit is not a Democratic or a Republican issue. Our cities—large and small cities—throughout this country are getting into transit: bus rapid transit, light rail, and regional rail.

And the notion that, ironically, especially on the same week you are announcing an infrastructure plan, you would, at the same time, say no new starts in transit is just beyond belief.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, is the gentleman saying that the President's budget is inconsistent with the President's transportation plan? In the transportation plan he talks about new starts, new programs, and so forth, but he is eliminating those in the budget, transferring that money over to the new programs that I guess he wants to call the Trump programs. Is that what is happening here?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. That appears to be what is happening. Or else the OMB Director and the President's people in the White House doing this infrastructure plan never checked with each other.

I do think the bait-and-switch aspect is the most incredible aspect of this because it really, really would damage transportation efforts that we already depend on.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PRICE for those comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it is a real honor and privilege to join both of my colleagues here for what is a very important discussion to have.

I commend Congressman GARAMENDI for always being passionate, considerate, and diligent on these efforts around the issues that are germane and important to this country moving forward and being successful. So I thank him for being a role model for me here in the House of Representatives.

Also, I thank Mr. PRICE, who has been a leader. I worked with him on several occasions in North Carolina on different issues. It is good to be in both of their company on this important issue.

We are here tonight on this Special Order talking about the President's infrastructure plan. It is not really much of a transportation plan at all. What President Trump has proposed is another massive giveaway to big corporations.

The Trump infrastructure plan would privatize much of the Nation's infrastructure. It would replace interstate highways with tollways. It would roll back environmental protection regula-

tions and workers' rights. It would award infrastructure grants based on how much revenue is raised locally, instead of awarding Federal grants based on the project's quality.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump promised America a trillion-dollar investment in our Nation's crumbling infrastructure. But, like always, the President has not delivered.

This is becoming a theme with him as we move through different issues that this Nation faces. There is a pattern developing here. My father always used to mention that type of thing. When he saw issues or something that were going awry, he would notice the pattern in the way these things are addressed. There is definitely a pattern in the way the President has handled being Commander in Chief, and has not necessarily been in the best interest of the entire country, but to a select few.

The Trump infrastructure plan is cut from the same cloth as the tax scam my Republican colleagues passed in December. It is cut from the same cloth as the budget President Trump proposed this week.

The tax scam was a massive giveaway to the billionaires and big corporations, to golf course owners and to owners of LLCs. Now, I don't know much about big business and golf courses—I am a miniature golf man myself—but, once again, there is that pattern.

What would be so important in the tax scam that you carve out something for golf course owners?

Well, anyway. Can you say Mar-a-Lago?

Also, in that same vein, if I am not mistaken, all of the Trump businesses that are still being enriched as he sits in the White House, which is totally contrary to what this Nation was built on, are all LLCs.

□ 2000

So in the tax scam, there was a carve-out for LLCs. Oh my goodness. There seems to be a pattern here.

Trump proposed a budget that slashes more than \$168 billion—\$168 billion from Federal highway, transit, Amtrak, and water infrastructure funding. He also proposed that we privatize the Nation's air traffic control, which would add another \$57 billion to the Federal deficit. So much for deficit hawks.

So, before even proposing his infrastructure plan, the President proposed a \$225 billion cut to infrastructure spending, all so he can pay for his tax giveaways to the rich.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats and Republicans want to work together to rebuild America's crumbling infrastructure, but the President's plan doesn't get us there at all. It is a partisan proposal that benefits the President's corporate friends at the expense of the American people.

This infrastructure plan is a major blow to my constituents and everyone who travels along Amtrak's Northeast

corridor. It proposes an Infrastructure Incentives Program that would award grants based on how much revenue is raised locally, instead of how badly needed the project is.

Now, that seems not to make too much sense from where I am standing, and my constituents understand, and Congressman GARAMENDI's constituents, and the majority of people in this House, if you really pulled them aside and asked them honestly. But that is for another day.

Take, for instance, the Gateway project. The Gateway project is a multiyear, multibillion-dollar project that will repair, replace, and expand the railroad infrastructure connecting New Jersey and New York, but Boston to Washington, D.C., as well. It is the Nation's most critical infrastructure project.

The Gateway project will make commutes safe and more reliable for hundreds of thousands of people, and the economic activity it generates could create upwards of 100,000 new jobs in the region.

This multiyear project, Mr. Speaker, is vital to this Nation's health and infrastructure. The Northeast corridor is the only line that is profitable for Amtrak in the entire Nation; and we want to cripple that. We don't want to strengthen that. We would like to cripple that more. It doesn't make sense.

The Gateway project is something that is needed. It will put Americans to work. It will create a greater infrastructure and allow the two tunnels going into New York City now to be repaired. They took a terrible beating from Superstorm Sandy, and the corrosive saltwater got into a lot of those tunnels, damaged the electrical work in those tunnels; and I am glad my constituents and people going back and forth between New York and New Jersey don't get to see the shape that these hundred-year-old tunnels are in.

So once we create this new tunnel, it would allow us to repair the other two, which is desperately needed—desperately needed.

So it is the Nation's most critical infrastructure project that we see. The Gateway project will make commuters safe. It could generate, as I said, more than 100,000 new jobs in the region.

The Gateway project is necessary to modernize Amtrak's Northeast corridor, which runs between Boston and D.C. It is a project that benefits people from States up and down the Atlantic seaboard. That is why the Federal Government agreed to cover half of the cost of the Gateway project, with New York and New Jersey splitting the other half.

And if my colleague would—who has greater knowledge of these issues over the years—to have a State come along and be willing—you know, we think that 70/30 splits are good with States, but New Jersey and New York has said: We will do 50/50. Now, if we can't understand how that is a positive, and that the States are willing to do their part, then we don't understand these issues.

I am new to this, so I would—will the gentleman elaborate on the—I have heard that 80/20 splits are good and 70/30 are great. And here is a 50/50 split, yet, and still, we cannot get the Federal Government to buy in, which, when Amtrak said they would take over the Northeast corridor, the Federal Government was supposed to fund them to the levels they needed in order to maintain it. And Amtrak has never received the dollars that was promised since the inception of taking over the Northeast corridor.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to answer the gentleman's question. It doesn't make any sense. What the President proposes, instead of the normal 80/20, sometimes a 75/25 split in which the Federal Government is the major partner so that these transportation systems are of national importance—the President is proposing across for all kinds of projects, wherever they may be, on the Northeast corridor, or on the West Coast, or anywhere in between, that he flip it over and the Federal Government becomes the minority partner, at 20 percent; and the State, the county, the city, or in the case of New York, the tri-borough—

Mr. PAYNE. Tri-State.

Mr. GARAMENDI. The tri-State entity comes up, in this case, as the gentleman said, 50 percent. But that is not good enough. He wants 20 percent Federal and 80 percent tri-State. It is a formula for a major disaster for America's infrastructure, because it is not just tunnels and Amtrak, it is water systems. It is repairing the Flint system, repairing the Chowchilla water system in California; it is the flood control. It goes on and on and on.

Unless, of course, you happen to be a Wall Street investor, and you want to—well, let's say you want to build that tunnel. Well, the Federal Government will give you 80 percent. You come up with 20 percent. And by the way, what is going to be the cost to the commuter?

So none of this makes much sense, except for one thing. Thankfully, the President, after a year plus, has come forward with a plan. We will work with that. We will take his bad plan, we will do a judo move on it, we will flip it, and then we will build a definite program for America. Let's call it a better deal for America, a better infrastructure plan. What do you think? Can we do that, Mr. PAYNE?

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the gentleman is on the right track. We are willing to work with the President. And this, unfortunately, is another incident or an example of where his lack of knowledge of government operation is hampering what we need to do in this Nation.

It is very difficult to learn on the job, especially when you have the job of Commander in Chief and you have had no experience with the government, understanding the Senate, understanding how the House—how it operates.

We are willing to help him. We want him to be successful, because if he is successful, the Nation can be successful—not on his own, not his own personal success, but success for the Nation.

I will come to a conclusion, as I see one of my colleagues who is on the Northeast corridor has joined us as well, but just to your point about water infrastructure.

So the Congressional Black Caucus went to Flint to meet with the residents there, and Ms. PELOSI was on the trip and sat and met different people and what they were going through at that time. It was just sad, heart-breaking.

So me, traveling back to Newark, New Jersey, which is the third oldest city in the United States of America, understanding if they were having those issues in Flint, which is nowhere near as old as Newark, New Jersey, what were the conditions in my community?

And lo and behold, I spoke to several mayors in my district, and I said: You need to start looking at your water system. Based on what I saw in Flint, I am very concerned.

And don't you know, that Tuesday, they found lead in 30 schools in Newark, New Jersey, in the water system.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I do need to move on to Mr. CICILLINE here, but Mr. PAYNE was asking about the water systems. Just look at real dollars, 2014 dollars, where the Federal investment has gone over the last 25 years, almost 30 years. So no wonder that we are not repairing and rebuilding.

Mr. Speaker, let me turn to Mr. CICILLINE who, together with his teammates, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), developed a way of describing what it is we need to do. Last week, Mr. CICILLINE took on this issue of transportation, infrastructure, generally, and made a proposal. Could the gentleman share with us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the gentleman for yielding and for his many years of extraordinary leadership on not only Make It In America, but on the urgency of rebuilding the infrastructure of our country.

Tonight, I think the American people can see these two things really intersect, because what Democrats have proposed is for the Federal Government to be a real partner again in rebuilding our country, something that cities and States just can't do on their own.

The Federal Government has to play a real role, and we have put together a framework for a \$1 trillion investment in rebuilding our roads, our bridges, our ports, our transit systems, our schools, and making the investments that will create 16 million good-paying jobs and will create a platform to grow our economy, address urgent needs.

You know, America used to lead the world, was the envy of the world in our infrastructure. That is no longer the case. We are now behind countries like

the United Arab Emirates and Singapore, according to the World Economic Forum.

As Mr. GARAMENDI put up there, the American Society of Civil Engineers gives us a failing grade on America's infrastructure. An estimated 56,000 of America's bridges are structurally deficient. One out of every 5 miles of highway pavement in our country is in poor condition.

But, of course, we don't need those report cards. We don't need these reports to tell us. The American people experience it every day: being stuck in traffic, having disruptions in their rail service, having repairs to their cars. Our constituents feel it every day; and that is why it is so disappointing that the President has been unwilling to work with Democrats in a bipartisan way to craft an infrastructure plan that will actually rebuild the country, create good-paying jobs, make us the envy of the world again.

Instead, he puts forth this sort of bait-and-switch. First of all, it is a \$200 billion investment. Our plan is five times that. And then he says: Oh, it is really \$1.7 million. Why? Because his friends are going to privatize public infrastructure and create tolls and higher costs for users.

That is not what infrastructure is. Infrastructure is a public investment. The Federal Government plays a role.

And then he proposes a budget that makes deep cuts in transportation—actually, almost as much as he proposed spending. So it is like, I am willing to invest zero in infrastructure is basically what the President is saying.

We need a real infrastructure plan. As Mr. GARAMENDI said, we put forth a better deal to rebuild America, a real investment of infrastructure that will also protect environmental standards, worker rights, create good-paying jobs.

Instead, what the President proposed, after all this fanfare, is a proposal one-fifth the size, while, at the same time, he is making deep cuts in infrastructure programs and shreds environmental protections, shreds worker rights.

We, of course, put in our plan ways to accelerate so these things can move forward, but it has got to be done in a way that respects labor and environmental standards.

Mr. GARAMENDI has been here longer than I have. That is sort of sad. This was always a bipartisan issue. We could agree on the urgency, the necessity of rebuilding our country.

□ 2015

It should be about national priority.

We should all be committed to doing this. This is another flimflam. This proposal is basically to privatize public infrastructure, make big corporations and wealth investors rich and let working class and middle class folks pay for it.

It is the same thing we saw in the tax bill, the same thing we saw in the

budget. It is very disappointing, and I am hoping the President will study the Democratic framework and work with us to actually invest in and rebuild our country in a way that we can all be proud of.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, there are so many things we need to talk about.

First of all, that \$200 billion is simply repurposing existing programs, and they are laid out here. The highway fund, \$122 billion reduced, transferred over to his new program, which is really, really strange. He calls it \$100 billion of innovation.

Who is going to determine what is innovative? Who is going to determine what is going to be funded?

A whole new administrative and serious chaos is going to occur—TIGER grants, gone, Amtrak. Mr. PAYNE was just talking about Amtrak and the importance here in the Northeast corridor.

I am from California, but I have got to tell you, I care a great deal about Amtrak because that is how I like to get from Washington to New York City. That is the best way to do it. Airplanes are fine, but, actually, Amtrak is just faster if you want to get downtown to downtown.

But not to worry. He is going to privatize Reagan and Dulles. And you think that is going to work out well for us? Oh, if you want to pay more money, yes. Rural air service.

Army Corps of Engineers, extremely important to us on the West Coast, in my district. I have quite possibly the highest flood potential of any place outside of New Orleans, and we depend upon this, and yet they are going to cut it by \$10 billion.

It goes on and on and on. This is just the beginning of what is proposed. It is a massive shell game. The money is under this shell. No, the money is under that shell. It is the same money back and forth.

We need a real program, and I am so pleased that you and your colleagues put together a real trillion-dollar program. It is solid. It is foundational. And what an opportunity was missed in this wonderful Christmas gift that the President gave to whom? The top 1 percent and American corporations.

Ponder this for a moment: For every 1 percent reduction in the Federal corporate tax rate, it is \$100 billion.

Corporations and the Chamber of Commerce were saying from 35 take it down to 25 percent. No. Our Republican colleagues and the President went all the way to 21 percent. Let's see, 25, 21, 4—4 percentage points. That is \$400 billion over 10 years.

Think of the possibilities if, instead of that money flowing to corporations who apparently are going to use that money for stock buybacks and dividends, not for new investments—oh, excuse me. They did say they had increased the wages. Do a careful study. Most of those wage increases are in States and localities that have increased the minimum wage.

So \$400 billion right there. Could it have been used? Yes. Foreign earnings? Mr. DELANEY, 40 Democrats, 40 Republicans put on the floor a proposal to repatriate those foreign earnings back here to the United States, very low tax rate, far lower than what is in the tax bill if that money was going into an infrastructure bank, into investments, real investments in America.

Mr. Speaker, I know Mr. CICILLINE has worked long and hard on this. I would like to hear more. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that the President proposed and the Republicans passed a tax scam that rewarded the wealthiest people in this country and the biggest corporations. Eighty-three percent of that tax cut went to the top 1 percent.

It created a debt of \$1.5 trillion plus interest—over \$2 trillion—for the next generation. Can you imagine if, instead of a giveaway to people who didn't need it, that money were invested in rebuilding our country? You could create 16 million good-paying jobs. You could create an incredible power for our economy so we can move goods and services and information to rebuild the economy.

But then you think about the willingness to give away that amount of money to the top 1 percent, 83 percent of the tax cut, if, instead, you had invested it in this urgent priority that impacts the daily lives of every single American, what a difference it would have made.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) for the many, many years that he has worked on this issue and underscoring every week the importance of investing in products made in America, and now making sure that, as we rebuild America, that we focus on products and innovative materials that are made here in the USA.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. CICILLINE seems to have prompted some energy and excitement for Mr. PAYNE. It seems as though he wanted to jump in and say a few more words. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to thank both of my colleagues and Mr. PRICE for really showing a youngster at this how to engage the American people.

And these issues, Mr. Speaker, are critical to Americans across the Nation. And, yes, there is a swath that does not have these issues to worry about, but there are people every single day who need to have us address these issues in the manner in which we are speaking.

Everyone is not well off. Everyone is not able to buy for themselves. Everyone is not the owner of a golf course. Everyone is not the President of an LLC.

There are hardworking people. There are people who need jobs. Reinvesting in infrastructure will put Americans to

work, will give all Americans the quality of life that they deserve in this Nation if they are willing to work for it, and we understand that. But give them the opportunity to work for it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, there are so many things that we are going to talk about over the next several months.

The President did a good thing by putting the infrastructure program on the front burner. Now, obviously, from what I have said this last hour and my colleagues, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. PRICE, the proposal doesn't fly. It is not a solid proposal that will solve the problems of America in a way that is good for the people you just talked about, the working men and women and the families of America.

But we can work together on this, the program that the Democrats have put out, A Better Deal for America, an infrastructure plan that includes all of the elements. We haven't talked about broadband and the availability of broadband in rural areas, which I happen to represent, high-speed internet, but that is also a problem in the urban areas.

We have a common interest in a good, solid infrastructure plan. Unfortunately, we are looking at the deficit hawks returning. They disappeared last November and December when the tax bill went through. In fact, the President's budget contemplates a \$1 trillion deficit each and every year for the next 10 years.

So where's the money?

Well, \$1.5 trillion wound up in the top 1 percent and for the American corporations and the LLCs and golf courses, as you said. That is money that could have been used for the infrastructure, building the foundation for economic growth, educating, reeducating, teaching the skills.

Now, the President mentioned that in his address on infrastructure, and good. But where's the money? Show me the money.

Well, it is a shell game. It ends one program, starts a new one. Administrative chaos will ensue. We need real, solid investment, and we can do it. The proposals are there.

And we are going to talk about this every week, every day, every community meeting. We are going to talk about the tax scam and where the money went. We are going to talk about the wealthy getting wealthier. We will talk about income inequality and the way in which it invests, it actually creates more. And we are going to talk about the great missed opportunities: education, highways, water systems, sanitation systems, ports, multimodal. That is what we need to do.

Mr. Speaker, I am losing my voice, and I yield back the balance of my time.

IN HONOR OF RAYMOND SIMS
BAUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAST). Under the Speaker's announced